## **EXHIBIT B**

Harry T. Lawless, Ph.D.

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE: METHYL : Master File TERTIARY BUTYL ETHER : C.A. No.

("MTBE") PRODUCTS : 1:00-1898

LIABILITY LITIGATION :

: MDL 1358(SAS)

This document relates :

to the following : M21-88

cases:

:

City of New York v. : Amerada Hess Corp., et : al., 04 Civ. 3417 :

April 9, 2009

Videotaped expert deposition of HARRY T. LAWLESS, Ph.D., taken pursuant to notice, was held at the law offices of Blank Rome LLP, The Chrysler Building, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York, beginning at 9:13 a.m., on the above date, before Kimberly A. Cahill, a Federally Approved Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public.

GOLKOW TECHNOLOGIES, INC. 877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax deps@golkow.com

|    | <del></del>   |    |  |
|----|---|----|--|
|    | Page 58   |    | Page 60  |
| 1  | A. I don't think so.                                | 1  | plate right now task-wise from Mr. Robins        |
| 2  | Q. Did you review any                               | 2  | or his colleagues with respect to this           |
| 3  | depositions taken in this case?                     | 3  | case? Have they asked you to do anything         |
| 4  | A. In this case.                                    | 4  | else?  |
| 5  | Q. In this case.                                    | 5  | A. I don't think so.                             |
| 6  | A. No oh, I reviewed the                            | 6  | <li>Q. As things stand right now,</li>           |
| 7  | deposition of no, no depositions.                   | 7  | is it your intention prior to giving             |
| 8  | Q. Did counsel offer to you the                     | 8  | testimony in this case to conduct any            |
| 9  | opportunity to interview New York City              | 9  | experiment or do any research or do any          |
| 10 | employees?  | 10 | other further analysis?                          |
| 11 | A. No.  | 11 | A. At this moment, no.                           |
| 12 | <ul><li>Q. Did you ask for the</li></ul>            | 12 | Q. When you made the suggestion                  |
| 13 | opportunity to interview New York City              | 13 | to Mr. Robins with respect to consumer           |
| 14 | employees?  | 14 | rejection testing, what again was his            |
| 15 | A. No.  | 15 | reaction?  |
| 16 | Q. Did counsel offer to you the                     | 16 | A. I don't recall. I think he                    |
| 17 | opportunity to review depositions of New            | 17 | was noncommittal.                                |
| 18 | York City employees?                                | 18 | My comment was merely that                       |
| 19 | A. No.  | 19 | the methodology existed. I did not, in           |
| 20 | <ul><li>Q. Did you ask for the</li></ul>            | 20 | fact, suggest the test.                          |
| 21 | opportunity?  | 21 | Q. Okay.   |
| 22 | A. No.  | 22 | What was the motivation for                      |
| 23 | <ul> <li>Q. Have you made any inquiry or</li> </ul> | 23 | making the comment?                              |
| 24 | study or analysis of the instances, if              | 24 | <ol> <li>That it was unfortunate that</li> </ol> |
|    | Page 59   |    | Page 61  |
| 1  | any, of taste and odor complaints made by           | 1  | this hadn't been done.                           |
| 2  | the consuming public within the City of             | 2  | Q. You do believe, don't you,                    |
| 3  | New York?   | 3  | that it would be informative of the              |
| 4  | A. No.  | 4  | issues presented in this litigation?             |
| 5  | Q. So is it fair to say that                        | 5  | A. Yes, I do.                                    |
| 6  | you do not intend to testify in this case           | 6  | Q. The methodology that you                      |
| 7  | that there is any connection between a              | 7  | have in mind, how many people would it           |
| 8  | particular complaint received by the City           | 8  | involve, how many test subjects?                 |
| 9  | or complaints and the presence of MTBE in           | 9  | A. I haven't thought about that                  |
| 10 | that consumer's water?                              | 10 | in great detail, but I would say, you            |
| 11 | A. That's a little                                  | 11 | know, a good sample size for this kind of        |
| 12 | hypothetical. I would say that I would              | 12 | thing would be certainly over a hundred          |
| 13 | reserve the right to testify about any              | 13 | and maybe somewhere under 300.                   |
| 14 | other information that's given to me                | 14 | Q. Have you conducted testing                    |
| 15 | before the trial.                                   | 15 | of this type before?                             |
| 16 | Q. But as things stand right                        | 16 | A. Of consumer rejection                         |
| 17 | now, is it fair to say that your                    | 17 | thresholds?                                      |
| 18 | testimony is not going to be consist                | 18 | Q. Yes.  |
| 19 | of any opinions linking the presence of             | 19 | A. Not using this specific                       |
| 20 | MTBE in New York City water to any                  | 20 | methodology, no.                                 |
| 21 | particular taste or odor complaints from            | 21 | Q. Have you conducted other                      |
| 22 | consumers?  | 22 | kinds of, shall we call them, consumer           |
| 23 | A. That's correct.                                  | 23 | acceptability tests?                             |
|    |   |    | •  |
| 24 | Q. Is there anything on your                        | 24 | A. Yes.  |